R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 639 TE 000 111

A SURVEY OF LINGUISTIC UNITS IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS.

BY- LEVIN, MIRIAM K.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, PRINCETON, N.J.

REPORT NUMBER TDR-66-5 PUB DATE DEC 66
COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD, NEW YORK, N.Y.
REPORT NUMBER RDR-66-7-NO-7
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.96 22P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH CURRICULUM, *ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, *LINGUISTICS, *SECONDARY SCHOOLS, GRAMMAR, TEACHER EDUCATION, CLASS SIZE,

TO SURVEY THE TEACHING OF LINGUISTICS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS, THE EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE (ETS) ASKED 650 ENGLISH TEACHERS TO COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRES DESIGNED TO ELICIT INFORMATION ABOUT THE KIND AND EXTENT OF THEIR LINGUISTICS TRAINING, THE NATURE AND SIZE OF THE POPULATIONS STUDYING LINGUSTICS IN THEIR CLASSES, AND THE VOCABULARY AND CONTENT OF THEIR UNITS IN LINGUISTICS. ON THE BASIS OF THE FIRST 418 COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES PROCESSED, THREE CONCLUSIONS WERE REACHED. (1) A STRONG TREND TOWARD THE TEACHING OF LINGUISTICS EXISTS. (2) A STEADILY INCREASING TEACHER POPULATION IS BEING TRAINED IN THE NEW GRAMMAR. (3) THE TYPICAL 25-YEAR LAG BETWEEN RESEARCH FINDINGS AND CLASSROOM USE IS DEMONSTRABLY DECREASING IN THE CASE OF LINGUISTICS. (A COPY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, SHOWING RESPONSES, IS INCLUDED.) (MM)

AL 000 134

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT REPORTS
RDR-66-7, No. 7

•

TEST DEVELOPMENT REPORT
TDR-66-5 DECEMBER 1966

A Survey of Linguistics Units in the High Schools

•

Miriam K. Levin
Test Development Division, ETS

TE000 111

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Educational Testing Service TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

A SURVEY OF LINGUISTICS UNITS IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS

In February 1966, the Test Development Division of Educational Testing Service decided to undertake a survey of the teaching of linguistics in the high schools. Accordingly, a questionnaire was prepared in order to obtain information on curriculum developments in this area, information that would be particularly useful to the College Entrance Examination Board as it considers developing and offering new tests in English.

Such a survey is especially pertinent to the English Language-Study Test, a test frankly anticipatory of curriculum trends. This examination is to be offered for the first time in February 1968 as part of the Supplementary Achievement Test program. At the present time, it is clear that the secondary school population which has had a systematic and sequential study of linguistics is very small indeed. However, the recommendations of the Commission on English and the governmental support of Project English Centers which are developing curriculum materials have given impetus to the kind of high school study which the examination is designed to test. It should be noted also that the schools which currently offer units on linguistics are those with a distinguished record of curriculum development and experimentation. The list includes Newton High School, Newtonville, Massachusetts; Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois; Staples High School, Westport, Connecticut. Other school systems are likely to follow their lead.

Project English Centers, directors of NDEA institutes, and the NCTE were consulted for assistance in identifying secondary teachers who are working with linguistic materials. In addition, the committee responsible for creating the new examination recommended educators who are active in fostering curriculum development in linguistics, linguists working in teacher-training institutions, curriculum specialists, and secondary teachers whose work had come to their attention. Contributors to professional journals who had mentioned working in high school linguistics programs were also contacted.

The questionnaire sent to the teachers (included in this report as Appendix A) was designed to elicit information about (a) the kind and extent of their linguistics training, (b) the nature and size of the population studying linguistics in their classes, and (c) the vocabulary and content of their units in linguistics.

A total of 418 questionnaires were tabulated.[1] For convenience, the responses of the teachers have been indicated by percentages rather than by whole numbers. No question was answered by all 418 teachers. The reasons for these omissions are various. If the person responding was a language-arts supervisor, department chairman, or language consultant, the first 9 questions,

---

[1]Because there was a premium on getting certain information quickly, the survey maintained a rigid time schedule. A total of 650 questionnaires were sent out April 15-30 to teachers whose names had been received by that date. The 418 completed questionnaires received by June 1 were sent to data processing.

TE000 111

for example, may not have been applicable to his particular situation. In the case of other questions, the teacher may have written out a response detailing a more specific answer which could not be tabulated as a simple yes or no. And for others, the teacher may, despite directions to the contrary, have checked only positive responses, ignoring the negative box. In the analysis, all percentages reprinted are based on the 418 teachers in the total sample. For each question, the percentage not replying is indicated.

The Sample

In response to a letter requesting the names of teachers with linguistic training, several NDEA institutes provided ETS with class lists of participants in summer institutes. Others were more selective in recommending teachers. As a consequence, the sample is probably unrepresentative when considered on a national scale. For example, the Oregon Project English Center recommended 33 teachers; on the other hand, only 6 teachers from Ohio were included in the list of referrals. Appendix B lists the percentage of teachers from particular states who responded to the questionnaire. The large number of responses coming from Texas, Minnesota, and Nebraska reflects the availability of class lists. The disproportionate number from Pennsylvania (119) reflects both the existence of an active Project English Center and a city-wide (Pittsburgh) radio-television series whose director forwarded his list of school subscribers to the outline guide for the teaching units. Thus, for the most part, the sample consists of teachers affiliated in some way with institutions involved in curriculum development. It minimizes the curriculum development carried on by small groups of teachers within a school system. To be sure, when reports of new syllabuses developed outside of the larger institutions were reported in the journals or discussed at professional meetings, the authors were contacted. However, in the absence of a national clearing house for new syllabuses, the number of teachers included in the survey who were involved in curriculum development in independent programs is inevitably small when compared to the total sample.

Since many of the teachers were referred to ETS by Project English Centers, the characteristics of the sample have also been affected by the attempts of the various Centers to develop sequential units of instruction. Oregon, for example, has to date emphasized the training of junior high school teachers in modern grammar and has, therefore, concentrated on preparing teachers and syllabuses for units for grades 7 through 10. However, the Center is now writing the curriculum for grades 11 and 12. Similarly, the center affiliated with Carnegie Institute has concentrated on a program for the tenth grade. Units for eleventh- and twelfth-grade students may be expected shortly. Not unexpectedly then, the majority of surveyed teachers from Oregon teach in the junior high schools; those from Pennsylvania teach tenth-grade students.

ED 011 007

The Analysis of the Questionnaire Responses

The first nine questions on the questionnaire were concerned with background information on the teachers and their schools.

As a group, the respondents filling out the questionnaire were experienced teachers (65% had taught for more than 6 years) in schools with large populations (80% in schools with more than 700 students, 30% in schools with more than 1,600 students.) In 19% of the cases tabulated, the respondent taught in a school with a graduating class of 550 students or more; over 72% taught in schools with graduating classes of over 175 students. More than 40% of the teachers indicated that more than half of their students could be expected to go on to college. In very few instances was modern language study undertaken with classes of slow learners or as remedial instruction.

The responses to questions 10-13 provide information on the kind and extent of the linguistic training of the teachers participating in the survey. A breakdown of their responses yields the data below.

Teachers whose preparation has been restricted to an undergraduate or graduate course in linguistics.	8%
Teachers whose preparation has been restricted to a summer institute in linguistics.	4%
Teachers whose preparation has been restricted to an in-service course or workshop.	22%
Teachers who have had both a college course and a summer institute in linguistics but no in-service course.	28%
Teachers who have had both a college course and an in-service course c workshop but no summer institute.	13%
Teachers who have had both a summer institute and an in-service course or workshop but no college course.	4%
Teachers who have had a college course in linguistics and have participated in both a summer institute and an in-service course or workshop.	21%
	100%

As a group, 70% had studied linguistics as an undergraduate or graduate student for college credit, while 57% had participated in summer institutes and 60% had participated in in-service courses or workshops in linguistics. Over half (53%) indicated that they had studied linguistics systematically through an independent reading program.

Questions 14-43 asked about the analytical skills of the teacher and his familiarity with the various areas of linguistics. As a group, those who responded were strongest in the areas of changing attitudes toward usage and the history of the language. Eighty-one per cent had read specimens of Middle English; 73% had read specimens of Old English. Many teachers indicated some familiarity with earlier forms of the language in terms of vocabulary (68%), in terms of inflectional systems (62%), and in terms of grammatical features (61%). But while 87% of the teachers indicated that they had studied changing attitudes toward usage, only 60% said that their

study included material on the history of dictionaries. It may be inferred that in many cases, the study of usage was primarily concerned with matters of disputed usage (shall/will, who/whom).

For sentence analysis, 33% of the teachers use only the transformational-generative approach, 8% use only IC analysis, while 23% indicated that they use both systems. As a group then, 56% make some use of transformational-generative grammar, 31% some use of IC analysis. Sixty-five per cent indicated that they could read phonetic notation. 58% said that they could transcribe language phonetically; 20% indicated that they use Trager-Smith notation.

Questions 14-30 are rearranged below in descending order of positive responses.

Have you studied changing attitudes toward usage? 87%

Has your study of linguistics included work in the history of the language? 85%

Have you read specimens of Middle English? 81%

Have you analyzed varieties of American English? 77%

Have you read specimens of Old English? 73%

Has your study included any work in semantics? 70%

Have you analyzed older forms of the language in terms of vocabulary? . . . 68%

Can you read phonetic notation? 65%

Have you analyzed older forms of the language in terms of their inflectional systems? 62%

Have you analyzed older forms of the language in terms of their grammatical features? 61%

Has your study included material on the history of dictionaries? 60%

Can you transcribe language phonetically? 58%

In analyzing sentences do you use the transformational-generative approach? 56%

Can you read IPA notation? 36%

In analyzing sentences, do you use IC analysis? 31%

Have you used the Linguistic Atlas? 30%

Do you use Trager-Smith notation? 20%

In questions 31-43, the teacher was asked if he had read books or articles by writers in the field. The writers, listed in the order of the percentage of affirmative responses, are:

Roberts	89%	Gleason	43%
Fries	74%	Baugh	36%
Francis	61%	Ives	31%
Chomsky	61%	Hill	31%
Sledd	59%	Thomas	28%
H. Allen	48%	Kurath	26%
		Lloyd	20%

The high ranking of Paul Roberts in this list is unquestionably due to the availability of the Roberts high school texts. Though designed for secondary school students, it is clear that they

also serve many teachers as an introduction to linguistics. The continuing interest of teachers in matters of usage is underscored by the preponderance of positive responses to C.C. Fries.

Questions 45-52 were aimed at getting some idea of the nature and size of the high school population studying linguistics. About 32% of the teachers indicated that they teach a linguistics unit to more than 100 students in the current year; 27% teach linguistics to between 50 and 99 students.

At present the most comprehensive units (those continuing for more than 12 weeks of a semester) are taught in the seventh, eighth and ninth grades. Of the seventh-grade teachers responding to the questionnaire, 47% teach units of 9 weeks or more, of the eighth-grade teachers 51%, of the ninth-grade teachers 62%. These percentages decline for the upper grades, however. Of the tenth-grade teachers responding, only 28% have units longer than 9 weeks, for eleventh-grade teachers 17%, for the twelfth-grade teachers only 20%. However, 38% of the tenth-grade teachers have units lasting from 5-8 weeks. The heaviest concentration for grades 11 and 12 indicates that almost 50% teach units of 4 weeks or less for both grade levels.

These figures clearly reflect the current emphasis of Project English Centers and the dearth of available texts or materials for the upper grades of the senior high school. However, these figures should change very soon, because in those instances where ETS received curriculum guides and plans, it is clear that in the next few years more work will be done on developing materials and training teachers to continue sequential programs in linguistics.

Questions 53-68 were designed to reveal the subject matter included in the teachers' units on linguistics. The teacher was asked to indicate which of the following areas were covered at any grade level in any of the teachers' units on linguistics. The areas are listed below in order of rank.

English sentence patterns	76%
attitudes toward usage	73%
meaning change	67%
inflections	63%
sources of the vocabulary	62%
history of the language	62%
American dialects	60%
dictionary use	60%
form classes	54%
transformational grammar	44%
Middle English	38%
phonemes	35%
Old English	32%
morphemes	27%
dictionary making	25%
immediate-constituent analysis	22%

The amount of the linguistic curriculum assigned to the area of grammatical analysis is more modest than had been anticipated. Although the questionnaire made no provision for indicating the relative emphasis within the total program of the various aspects of linguistic study, it is clear that the preparation of the teacher is reflected in what he teaches. Just as the history of the language and matters of usage have been emphasized in the teacher's study of language, so in his language units he is more likely to concentrate on these areas rather than on grammatical analysis. In addition, many of the teachers commented on the diversity of existing linguistic systems. Disturbed by the current upheaval among grammarians, many teachers have adopted a wait-and-see attitude and, for the present, concentrate on those areas of language study where greater unanimity and stability exist.

Questions 69-133 concern linguistic terminology and were designed to guide the test committee in the framing and wording of questions. The teacher was asked to indicate which of the listed terms are used by him in any of his classes on linguistics at any time. Some of the terms are synonymous (juncture/open transition, for example). The questions were designed to see which of two alternative terms had the greater currency or what concepts were being emphasized. Responses here also clarity the subject matter of a teaching area.

Term	Per Cent Using It
noun	80.8%
verb	80.3%
adjective	79.4%
determiner	77.3%
auxiliary	75.1%
verb phrase	73.2%
accent	66.5%
stress	64.4%
inflectional ending	60.5%
complement	58.6%
pitch	58.1%
analogy	57.9%
proper noun	57.4%
intensifier	57.2%
intonation	56.7%
jargon	54.0%
noun phrase	53.8%
kernel sentence	51.7%
common noun	51.4%
headword	51.4%

Term	Per Cent Using It
collective noun	51.2%
article	49.5%
form class	48.1%
noun cluster	47.1%
abstract noun	46.6%
concrete noun	45.7%
transform	45.2%
structure word	44.3%
juncture	43.1%
qualifier	42.6%
derivational endings	41.6%
phoneme	40.7%
diphthong	39.5%
class I word	37.1%
class III word	35.4%
verb marker	33.5%
morpheme	30.1%
tense marker	28.7%
structure class	28.0%
animate noun	24.6%
mass noun	24.4%
suprasegmentals	18.2%
particle	18.0%
IC analysis	17.0%
folk etymology	16.7%
insert sentence	16.3%
labial	15.1%
dental	14.6%
adjunct	14.1%
umlaut	13.9%
embedded constituents	13.4%
fricative	12.9%
isogloss	12.2%
tense morpheme	12.0%
acronym	12.0%
allophone	10.3%

Term	Per Cent Using It
matrix	9.8%
base adjective	9.6%
open class	8.9%
allomorph	8.9%
free morpheme	8.1%
open transition	7.4%
zero allomorph	5.3%
clipping	4.8%
hyperurbanism	3.6%

Responses to the vocabulary section of the questionnaire reflect the proliferation and fluidity of terminology in the field. Although some standardization can be expected once texts and curriculum materials become available, at present the diversity of programs is quite marked. However, differences are far from random. Teachers who use Roberts' Patterns of English generally do not know or use the terminology and techniques of Roberts' English Syntax. Until such time as Project English materials become generally available and transformational grammar stabilizes its analytic procedures, this situation is likely to continue. Pending the publication of suitable texts, many teachers work out their own units and exercises by culling appropriate material from their personal libraries. Thus, only 41% of the teachers sampled use a published text in their linguistics courses; many of the others attempt an eclectic, multiple approach relying on their own teaching materials.

Some of the more frequently cited texts and supplementary materials are listed below. The number following the citation indicates the total number of survey teachers mentioning the book as a text. Although over a hundred texts, handbooks, and dictionaries of one kind or another were mentioned, only those materials mentioned at least 5 times are listed.

Paul Roberts	English Sentences (35)
Paul Roberts	Patterns of English (19)
Paul Roberts	English Syntax (16)
Project English Materials	(31)
Malstrom and Ashley	Language in Society (8)
Nelson Francis	reprint of the first chapter of The English Language (7)
Robert Hall	Linguistics and Your Language (5)
Charlton Laird	The Miracle of Language (5)
Hayakawa	Language in Thought and Action (5)

Of the high school English texts published as a secondary school series in language and composition, three are especially popular: the Postman series (78); the Conlin and Herman series (39); and the Warriner series (8).

Conclusions

In view of the controversial nature of much of linguistics and of the paucity of available secondary school materials, the very existence of a strong trend toward the teaching of linguistics is surprising. Between February and May 1966, we were able to identify a sample of over 700 teachers to whom we could write for information. To be sure, the sample reached is a very limited one when one considers that there are 30,000 secondary schools in the United States. However, a population of even this size was not anticipated when the survey was undertaken.

It may be perfectly true that on a national level, "Many of the better high school English programs seem to have abandoned any formal and systematic study of English grammar. Unwilling to perpetuate the schoolroom grammar of the past, unable to introduce transformational grammar because of the limited background of the staff, most talk furtively about 'structural linguistics' and do little or nothing." (Squire, 1966) Admittedly, the school administrators who responded to the survey know that the training of their teachers is often meager and that the education of teachers as well as the development of syllabuses are pressing problems. However, many wrote to say that although linguistics was now only a small part of the over-all English program, their school systems have defined, if they have not finally adopted, rather specific additions to the English curriculum. Typically, the administrator spoke of a system- or school-wide program beginning within the next year or two. Experimental classes had already worked with new materials and the program was being expanded. Although some were quite tentative, very few saw any turning back. In general, the new curriculum seems to be developing along these lines: ninth grade, syntax; tenth grade, lexicography and semantics; eleventh grade, dialects and linguistic geography; and twelfth grade, the history of the language.

Reinforcing the trend, a steadily increasing teacher population is being trained in the new grammar. Many systems have extensive in-service programs and cooperate with Project English centers in the development of materials. Equally significant, Curriculum Patterns in English has pointed out that "approximately one college in seven has recently added or is actively considering adding required study of the English language beyond the freshman year for the student majoring in English." (Tuttle, 1965) In many colleges these new requirements have often had to be deferred for a lack of trained linguists to handle such courses, a situation which parallels that of the high schools. In view of the difficulties of acquiring competent personnel to teach linguistics courses and of the confusion in the field, the vigor of the trend is remarkable.

During the next few years very dramatic changes in the teaching of linguistics in the high schools can be expected. Considering that there has typically been a 25-year gap between research and the

implementation of research findings in the classroom, the present situation already demonstrates an astonishing acceleration of normal developments.

References

Squire, James R. National Study of High School English Programs: A School for All Seasons, English Journal, March, 1966, p. 289.

Tuttle, Donald R. Curriculum Patterns in English, Bulletin 1965, Number 21, U.S. Department of Education publication, Washington, 1965.

Appendix A

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD - EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

A Questionnaire on Linguistics

(Total number of processed questionnaires - 418)

School

Name _____

Location _____
(City) (State)

Principal _____

Name of Teacher _____

1. For how many years have you taught English at any grade level? (Please include the current academic year in your count.)

1 to 2 years	13% (1)	6 to 10 years	25% (3)
3 to 5 years	20% (2)	more than 10 years	40% (4)

(2% No Reply)

2. What grades are included in your school?

3% (1)	1 through 12	27% (5)	10 through 12
16% (2)	7 through 12	27% (6)	Other (if other please specify)
2% (3)	8 through 12		7-9
19% (4)	9 through 12		(6% No Reply)

3. Approximately how many students are enrolled in your school?

0% (1)	fewer than 100	25% (5)	700 to 1099
1% (2)	100 to 199	25% (6)	1100 to 1599
5% (3)	200 to 399	14% (7)	1600 to 2199
13% (4)	400 to 699	16% (8)	2200 or more

(1% No Reply)

4. What was the approximate size of the graduating class from your school in the spring of 1965?

1% (1)	less than 25	18% (5)	175 to 274
2% (2)	25 to 49	21% (6)	275 to 399
7% (3)	50 to 99	14% (7)	400 to 549
12% (4)	100 to 174	19% (8)	550 or more

(6% No Reply)

Which of the following curricula, or programs of study, are offered by your school?

	Yes	No	
5.	90% (1)	10% (2)	General
6.	95% (1)	5% (2)	College Preparatory (academic)
7.	69% (1)	31% (2)	Vocational
8.	90% (1)	10% (2)	Commercial
9.	91% (1)	9% (2)	Home Economics and/or Industrial Arts

10. Have you studied linguistics in a college course as an undergraduate or graduate student for college credit?

70% (1) Yes 29% (2) No (1% No Reply)

11. Have you participated in a summer institute in linguistics?

57% (1) Yes 41% (2) No (2% No Reply)

12. Have you studied linguistics in an in-service course or workshop?

60% (1) Yes 38% (2) No (2% No Reply)

13. Have you studied linguistics systematically through an independent reading program?

53% (1) Yes 43% (2) No (4% No Reply)

If you replied No to questions 10-13, please omit the rest of the questionnaire.

14. Has your study of linguistics included work in the history of the language?

85% (1) Yes 8% (2) No (7% No Reply)

15. Have you read specimens of Old English?

73% (1) Yes 20% (2) No (7% No Reply)

16. Have you read specimens of Middle English?

81% (1) Yes 11% (2) No (8% No Reply)

17. Have you analyzed older forms of the language in terms of vocabulary?

68% (1) Yes 25% (2) No (7% No Reply)

18. Have you analyzed older forms of the language in terms of their grammatical features?

61% (1) Yes 32% (2) No (7% No Reply)

19. Have you analyzed older forms of the language in terms of their inflectional systems?

62% (1) Yes 30% (2) No (8% No Reply)

20. Can you transcribe language phonetically?

58% (1) Yes 33% (2) No (9% No Reply)

21. Have you used the Linguistic Atlas?

30% (1) Yes 62% (2) No (8% No Reply)

22. Have you analyzed varieties of American English?

77% (1) Yes 16% (2) No (7% No Reply)

23. Has your study included any work in semantics?

70% (1) Yes 23% (2) No (7% No Reply)

24. Has your study included material on the history of dictionaries?

60% (1) Yes 33% (2) No (7% No Reply)

25. Can you read phonetic notation?

65% (1) Yes 26% (2) No (9% No Reply)

26. Can you read IPA notation?

36% (1) Yes 54% (2) No (10% No Reply)

27. Do you use Trager-Smith notation?

20% (1) Yes 68% (2) No (12% No Reply)

28. Have you studied changing attitudes toward usage?

87% (1) Yes 5% (2) No (8% No Reply)

29. In analyzing sentences, do you use IC analysis?

31% (1) Yes 56% (2) No (13% No Reply)

30. In analyzing sentences do you use the transformational-generative approach?

56% (1) Yes 33% (2) No (11% No Reply)

In the course of your studies have you read books or articles by any of the following? If uncertain please check the No box.

31. C.C. Fries

74% (1) Yes 14% (2) No (12% No Reply)

32. Paul Roberts

89% (1) Yes 3% (2) No (8% No Reply)

33. Noam Chomsky

61% Yes (1) 26% No (2) (13% No Reply)

34. Owen Thomas

28% Yes (1) 51% No (2) (21% No Reply)

35. Nelson Francis

61% Yes (1) 24% No (2) (15% No Reply)

36. Archibald Hill

31% Yes (1) 48% No (2) (21% No Reply)

37. A.C. Baugh

36% Yes (1) 43% No (2) (21% No Reply)

38. Hans Kurath

26% Yes (1) 52% No (2) (22% No Reply)

39. Donald Lloyd

15% Yes (1) 60% No (2) (25% No Reply)

40. James Sledd

59% Yes (1) 25% No (2) (16% No Reply)

41. Harold Allen

48% Yes (1) 35% No (2) (17% No Reply)

42. Sumner Ives

31% Yes (1) 46% No (2) (23% No Reply)

43. H. A. Gleason

43% (1) Yes 37% (2) No (20% No Reply)

Others (please specify)_____

44. Have you taught linguistics in any of your classes at any grade level? If you check No, please omit the rest of the questionnaire.

81% (1) Yes 12% (2) No (7% No Reply)

For each grade level specified below, please check the appropriate box for the average length of the unit in linguistics. Omit those grade levels which you do not teach.

	Grade	none (1)	4 weeks or less (2)	5 to 8 weeks (3)	9 to 12 weeks (4)	more than 12 weeks (5)	(No. of teachers responding)
45.	7	9%	18%	26%	18%	29%	(68)
46.	8	7%	23%	19%	16%	35%	(86)
47.	9	4%	17%	17%	17%	45%	(139)
48.	10	5%	31%	36%	14%	14%	(84)
49.	11	8%	49%	27%	7%	9%	(75)
50.	12	6%	48%	26%	15%	5%	(89)

51. What percentage of your linguistics students are likely to go on to college?

15% (1) under 25%

24% (2) 25-50%

19% (3) 50-75%

21% (4) 75-100%

(21% No Reply)

52. What is the total number of linguistics students taught by you in the current year?

4% (1) fewer than 25

17% (2) 25-49

27% (3) 50-99

23% (4) 99-149

9% (5) 150 or over

(20% No Reply)

Have you covered any of the following in any of your units on linguistics at any grade level during the past year?

		(1)		(2)	
53.	history of the language	62% Yes		14% No	(24% No Reply)
54.	Old English	32% Yes		36% No	(32% No Reply)
55.	Middle English	38% Yes		32% No	(30% No Reply)
56.	sources of the vocabulary	62% Yes		13% No	(25% No Reply)
57.	meaning change	67% Yes		9% No	(24% No Reply)
58.	inflections	63% Yes		12% No	(25% No Reply)
59.	English sentence patterns	76% Yes		4% No	(20% No Reply)
60.	phonemes	35% Yes		37% No	(28% No Reply)
61.	morphemes	27% Yes		42% No	(31% No Reply)
62.	American dialects	60% Yes		15% No	(25% No Reply)
63.	transformational grammar	44% Yes		28% No	(28% No Reply)
64.	immediate-constituent analysis	22% Yes		47% No	(31% No Reply)
65.	attitudes toward usage	73% Yes		5% No	(22% No Reply)
66.	dictionary making	25% Yes		43% No	(32% No Reply)
67.	dictionary use	60% Yes		16% No	(24% No Reply)
68.	form classes	54% Yes		20% No	(26% No Reply)

other (please specify)_____

Please check Yes if you use any of the following terms in any of the classes in linguistics at any time. Check No if you do not.

		(1)		(2)	
69.	noun	80.8% Yes		.5% No	(18.7% No Reply)
70.	abstract noun	46.6% Yes		29.9% No	(23.5% No Reply)
71.	concrete noun	45.7% Yes		31.3% No	(23.0% No Reply)
72.	common noun	51.4% Yes		25.9% No	(22.7% No Reply)
73.	proper noun	57.4% Yes		20.6% No	(22.0% No Reply)

	(1)		(2)	
74. mass noun	24.4%	Yes	47.6%	No (28.0% No Reply)
75. collective noun	51.2%	Yes	25.1%	No (23.7% No Reply)
76. animate noun	24.6%	Yes	47.6%	No (27.8% No Reply)
77. class I word	37.1%	Yes	37.1%	No (25.8% No Reply)
78. noun cluster	47.1%	Yes	28.2%	No (24.7% No Reply)
79. noun phrase	53.8%	Yes	22.2%	No (24.0% No Reply)
80. headword	51.4%	Yes	25.1%	No (23.5% No Reply)
81. adjective	79.4%	Yes	2.0%	No (18.6% No Reply)
82. class III word	35.4%	Yes	38.3%	No (26.3% No Reply)
83. base adjective	9.6%	Yes	58.6%	No (31.8% No Reply)
84. verb	80.3%	Yes	.7%	No (19.0% No Reply)
85. verb phrase	73.2%	Yes	6.5%	No (20.3% No Reply)
86. tense morpheme	12.0%	Yes	57.4%	No (30.6% No Reply)
87. tense marker	28.7%	Yes	43.5%	No (27.8% No Reply)
88. inflectional endings	60.5%	Yes	15.8%	No (23.7% No Reply)
89. derivational endings	41.6%	Yes	32.1%	No (26.3% No Reply)
90. determiner	77.3%	Yes	4.0%	No (18.7% No Reply)
91. particle	18.0%	Yes	53.6%	No (28.4% No Reply)
92. article	49.5%	Yes	25.8%	No (25.8% No Reply)
93. auxiliary	75.1%	Yes	4.8%	No (20.1% No Reply)
94. verb marker	33.5%	Yes	40.0%	No (26.5% No Reply)
95. intensifier	57.2%	Yes	20.3%	No (22.3% No Reply)
96. qualifier	42.6%	Yes	30.9%	No (26.5% No Reply)
97. structure word	44.3%	Yes	30.6%	No (25.1% No Reply)
98. structure class	28.0%	Yes	44.2%	No (27.8% No Reply)
99. form class	48.1%	Yes	27.0%	No (24.9% No Reply)
100. open class	8.9%	Yes	60.5%	No (30.6% No Reply)

	(1)		(2)	
101. acronym	12.0%	Yes	58.6%	No (29.4% No Reply)
102. clipping	4.8%	Yes	64.8%	No (30.4% No Reply)
103. umlaut	13.9%	Yes	56.9%	No (29.2% No Reply)
104. folk etymology	16.7%	Yes	54.1%	No (29.2% No Reply)
105. hyperurbanism	3.6%	Yes	64.5%	No (31.9% No Reply)
106. jargon	54.0%	Yes	22.0%	No (24.0% No Reply)
107. analogy	57.9%	Yes	18.1%	No (24.0% No Reply)
108. phoneme	40.7%	Yes	34.4%	No (24.9% No Reply)
109. allophone	10.3%	Yes	59.6%	No (30.1% No Reply)
110. morpheme	30.1%	Yes	43.1%	No (26.8% No Reply)
111. allomorph	8.9%	Yes	61.0%	No (30.1% No Reply)
112. zero allomorph	5.3%	Yes	63.7%	No (31.1% No Reply)
113. free morpheme	8.1%	Yes	61.5%	No (30.4% No Reply)
114. suprasegmentals	18.2%	Yes	53.3%	No (28.5% No Reply)
115. stress	64.4%	Yes	14.1%	No (21.5% No Reply)
116. accent	66.5%	Yes	12.0%	No (21.5% No Reply)
117. pitch	58.1%	Yes	19.9%	No (22.0% No Reply)
118. juncture	43.1%	Yes	32.3%	No (24.6% No Reply)
119. open transition	7.4%	Yes	61.5%	No (31.1% No Reply)
120. intonation	56.7%	Yes	20.6%	No (22.7% No Reply)
121. IC analysis	17.0%	Yes	54.8%	No (28.2% No Reply)
122. kernel sentence	51.7%	Yes	25.3%	No (23.0% No Reply)
123. transform	45.2%	Yes	30.4%	No (24.4% No Reply)
124. embedded constituent	13.4%	Yes	58.6%	No (28.0% No Reply)
125. insert sentence	16.3%	Yes	55.2%	No (28.5% No Reply)
126. matrix	9.8%	Yes	60.3%	No (29.9% No Reply)

	(1)		(2)	
127. isogloss	12.2%	Yes	58.1%	No (29.7% No Reply)
128. complement	58.6%	Yes	17.0%	No (24.4% No Reply)
129. adjunct	14.1%	Yes	56.9%	No (29.0% No Reply)
130. fricative	12.9%	Yes	57.4%	No (29.7% No Reply)
131. labial	15.1%	Yes	55.7%	No (29.2% No Reply)
132. dental	14.6%	Yes	56.2%	No (29.2% No Reply)
133. diphthong	39.5%	Yes	34.4%	No (26.1% No Reply)

134. Do you use a published text in your linguistics courses?

41.4% Yes	34.9% No	(23.7% No Reply)
(1)	(2)	

Appendix B

The table below indicates the geographical spread of the teacher population filling out the questionnaire.

State	Per Cent	State	Per Cent
California	3.0%	New Hampshire	0.2%
Connecticut	3.9%	New Jersey	0.7%
District of Columbia	0.2%	New York	5.5%
Illinois	3.4%	Ohio	1.4%
Indiana	2.5%	Oregon	8.1%
Iowa	2.0%	Pennsylvania	28.4%
Kansas	1.4%	Texas	17.8%
Maryland	0.2%	Virginia	0.2%
Michigan	3.9%	Washington	1.4%
Minnesota	7.4%	Wisconsin	4.0%
Nebraska	4.1%		